## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

\_\_\_\_\_

EVERETT HADIX, et al.,

v.

Case No. 4:92-CV-110

Plaintiffs,

Hon. Richard Alan Enslen

PATRICIA L. CARUSO, et al.,

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_/

Upon hearing of February 21, 2007, the Court was persuaded that immediate injunctive relief was necessary to prevent further Eighth Amendment violations from occurring in the context of prisoner transfer and from further preventing prisoner transfers from interfering with the remedying of current and ongoing Eighth Amendment violations as to a significant population of medically fragile prisoner patients. This finding is supported by past findings of the District Court, including its decisions of November 13, 2006 and December 7, 2006, as well as the matter discussed during hearing and the shocking statistics contained in the February 16, 2007 Monthly Report Regarding Specialty Care.

This finding is supported by all four equitable factors pertinent under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(a): namely, (1) there is a strong likelihood of success on the merits in that the record supports that a very large percent of the transferring inmates have been subject to current and ongoing Eighth Amendment violations regarding medical care and the conditions of transfer are likely to further cause non-delivery of essential medical services; (2) this harm is irreparable in that many such prisoners may experience permanent injury and/or death as a consequence of delinquent care; (3) the harm to Defendants will not be substantial harm because the seven-day delay is slight;

Case 4:92-cv-00110-RJJ ECF No. 2332 filed 02/22/07 PageID.7201 Page 2 of 2

and (4) the public's interest is favored by honoring the Eighth Amendment. See Jones v. City of

Monroe, 341 F.3d 474, 476 (6th Cir. 2003); Nightclubs, Inc. v. City of Paducah, 202 F.3d 884, 888

(6th Cir. 2000); Basicomputer Corp. v. Scott, 973 F.2d 507, 511 (6th Cir. 1992); In re De Lorean

Motor Co., 755 F.2d 1223, 1228-30 (6th Cir. 1985).

Upon consideration of 18 U.S.C. § 3626(a)(2), the Court further finds that the injunctive relief

described below is narrowly drawn, extends no further than necessary to correct the harm, and is the

least intrusive means necessary to correct the harm. In so finding, the Court also gives substantial

weight to the adverse effects of the injunction upon public safety and the operation of the criminal

justice system and finds that such effects are minimal and do not militate against the injunctive relief.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants shall cease and desist from prisoner transfers

from *Hadix* facilities other than routine prisoner transfers not intended to reduce prisoner population

at the *Hadix* facilities.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the limitation expressed in the previous paragraph shall

commence effective Wednesday, February 21, 2007 at 5:00 p.m. nunc pro tunc and shall continue

in force for seven calendar days unless renewed, extended or modified.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs' motion for injunctive relief shall be filed

within such seven day period, as shall Defendants' response.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are directed to conduct further meeting with

the Medical Monitor for the purpose of finalizing the mental health/physical restraint plan and

submitting it for Court approval.

/s/ Richard Alan Enslen

DATED in Kalamazoo, MI:

RICHARD ALAN ENSLEN

February 22, 2007

SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE